REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is filed in reply to the Office Action dated January 13, 2004. In this Response, Applicants amend independent claims 1, 8, and 13 to traverse the Examiner's rejections. Amendments to the claims are not an acquiescence to any of the rejections. Furthermore, silence with regard to any of the Examiner's rejections is not an acquiescence to such rejections. Specifically, silence with regard to Examiner's rejection of a dependent claim, when such claim depends from an independent claim that Applicants consider allowable for reasons provided herein, is not an acquiescence to such rejection of the dependent claim(s), but rather a recognition by Applicants that such previously lodged rejection is moot based on Applicants' remarks and/or amendments relative to the independent claim (that Applicants consider allowable) from which the dependent claim(s) depends. Furthermore, amendments to the claims are being made solely to expedite prosecution of the instant application. Applicants reserve the option to further prosecute the same or similar claims in the instant or a subsequent application.

Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 1-17 are pending in the present application. The issues of the January 13, 2004 Office Action are presented below with reference to the Office Action.

<u>With regard to the Office Action Summary</u>: Applicants appreciate that the drawings filed on October 6, 2003 are accepted.

<u>With regard to the Office Action, paragraph 1</u>: Applicants thank the Examiner for noting that a Change of Address/Power of Attorney was filed on January 21, 2003. Applicants provide herein a Revocation of Power of Attorney and Change of Correspondence Address with respect to the subject case. Applicants respectfully request entry of the same.

<u>With regard to the Office Action, paragraphs 2-5</u>:
(1) Claims 1, 2, and 7-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,367,009) in view of Krueger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,962,533);

6

(2) Claims 4-6, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. and Krueger et al. in view of Ginzboorg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,240,091);

(3) Claims 3 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. and Krueger et al. in view of Grimmer (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,552).

With respect to (1) above, Applicants' independent claim 1, directed to an access system for a computer site, is amended to more clearly recite the claimed features to include, among other things, "a directory, coupled to the certificate authentication component, to maintain an *account for each user*, each account containing an *access policy specifying at least one portion of the computer site to which the corresponding user is permitted access*." The application provides that a "LDAP directory, which may be provided in the security application, may provide information … relating to a plurality of extranet users and the regions or sites of the extranet to which they are permitted access." Further, the "security application may also maintain an account for each user." (application, page 13, lines 4-8, line 16) Thus, an LDAP directory can maintain an *account for each user*, where each account contains an *access policy specifying portions of a computer site to which the corresponding user is permitted access*, as claimed in independent claim 1.

In contrast, Davis et al. do not teach such feature of Applicants' independent claim 1. Rather, Davis et al. teach access control in which access to a server (end-tier server) is either entirely granted or denied based on comparing a user name to a *list of authorized users*. If a user name is on the list, requests submitted to the server using the user name are processed, and if the user name is not on the list, requests submitted to the server using the user name are rejected (Davis et al., col. 13, lines 27-42). Davis et al. thus teach maintaining an *access control list* against which user names can be compared to grant or deny access. Davis et al.'s *access control list* <u>for a given server</u> is *not* the same as Applicants' claimed *account for each user*, where Applicants' independent claim 1 further states that *each account contains an access policy specifying at least one portion of the compute site to which the corresponding user is permitted access*.

Moreover, Krueger et al. also do not teach Applicants' claimed maintaining *an account for each user*, each account containing an *access policy specifying at least one portion of the computer site to which the corresponding user is permitted access*. Rather, Krueger et al. teach that every process executing on the computer system is associated with a user and a maximum

7

level of clearance. Additionally, each individual data word in the system is associated with a *security level.* Krueger et al. teach that a process/user can only access a data word when the process/user's *level of clearance* dominates the data word's *security level.* (Krueger et al., col. 1 lines 19-41) Unlike Applicants' claimed access policy that specifies a portion of the computer site to which the user is permitted access, Krueger et al.'s process/user *level of clearance* specifies nothing with regard to accessing anything in particular (e.g., data words), but rather, Krueger et al.'s process/user *level of clearance* exists to be compared to Krueger et al.'s data words' *security level,* whereupon access is determined only upon such comparison. Accordingly, Krueger et al.'s *level of clearance,* by itself, specifies nothing in terms of access, which is in contrast to Applicants' claimed *access policy specifying at least one portion of the computer site to which the corresponding user is permitted access.*

As Examiner knows, and based at least on MPEP 2143, a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) requires (1) a suggestion or motivation in the references themselves or generally known in the art, to combine the references, (2) a reasonable expectation of success to combine, and (3) a teaching, via the combination, of all the claimed limitations. *In re Vaeck,* 947 F. 2d. 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Because neither Davis et al. or Krueger et al., alone or in combination, teaches a directory, coupled to the certificate authentication component, to maintain an *account for each user,* each account containing an *access policy specifying at least one portion of the computer site to which the corresponding user is permitted access,* as claimed by Applicants in independent claim 1, a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not satisfied under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) at least for failing to show that all elements of Applicants' claims would be satisfied by the combination.

Applicants' silence with respect to other requirements for prima facie obviousness should not be construed as an acquiescence to such other requirements, but rather, a recognition by Applicants that the satisfaction or non-satisfaction of such elements is moot based on the failure of the proposed combination to show all elements of Applicants' claims.

Accordingly, Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 1 based on 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and consider independent claim 1, as amended, to be allowable. Similar to independent claim 1, independent claims 8 and 13, as amended, also recite "an account for each user, each account containing an access policy specifying at least one portion of the

8

computer site to which the corresponding user is permitted access." Accordingly, Applicants also consider independent claims 8 and 13 to be allowable. Claims 2-7 depend from allowable independent claim 1, claims 9-12 depend upon allowable independent claim 8, and claims 14-17 depend upon independent claim 13, and thus such dependent claims 2-7, 9-12, and 14-17 are also allowable for depending upon allowable base claims.

Conclusion

Applicants consider the Response herein to be fully responsive to the referenced Office Action. Based on the above Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, allowance is requested. If there are any remaining issues or the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with Applicants' attorney would be helpful in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (972) 718-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 13, 2004

Joel Wall
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 25,648

Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc.
c/o Christian Andersen
600 Hidden Ridge, HQE03H01
Irving, TX 75038
Tel.: (972) 718-4800
CUSTOMER NO. 32127

9